

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, and 14-33 are pending in this application. Claim 13 is canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are amended by the present response. No new matter is believed to be added. The cancellation of claim 13 and the amendments to claim 7 are believed to address the objections to those claims noted in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,522,846 to Kinouchi et al. (herein "Kinouchi"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,561,499 to Setoriyama. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0043523 to Fujita et al. (herein "Fujita") in view of U.S. patent 6,847,795 to Hirose et al. (herein "Hirose"), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0099479 to Nakafuji et al. (herein "Nakafuji"), and U.S. patent 6,236,181 to Baan. Claims 2, 13-15, 18, 20, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujita in view of Nakafuji and Baan. Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Fujita in view of Nakafuji and Baan as applied to claim 2, and further in view of Setoriyama. Claims 19, 21, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujita in view of Nakafuji and Baan as applied to claim 2, and further in view of Hirose. Claims 3 and 22-30 are allowed.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowance of claims 3 and 22-30.

Addressing now the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kinouchi, and the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Setoriyama, those rejections are traversed by the present response. Specifically, claim 7 is amended by

the present response to now be rewritten as a dependent claim that depends on claim 2. That amendment is believed to address the above-noted rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujita in view of Hirose, Nakafuji, and Baan, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The outstanding rejection cites Fujita as the primary reference, recognizing that “. . . Fujita et al. (. . . 523) do not disclose the claimed location of the secondary power supply, the insulation member, the wire size connecting the secondary power supply, the switch unit for a ventilation unit and cooling unit”.<sup>1</sup> To overcome certain of those recognized deficiencies in Fujita the outstanding rejection cites Hirose to “disclose an image forming apparatus including a power supply that is disposed below and in the neighborhood of a fixing unit (col. 5, lines 17-45; and figure 1)”.<sup>2</sup> Applicants first traverse that basis for the outstanding rejection.

Claim 1 recites “a secondary power supply that provides another portion of the heaters with power charged by said main power supply” and “said secondary power supply is disposed below and in a neighborhood of said fixing unit”. Thereby, in the claimed invention a power supply that provides heaters with power also charged by the main power supply is below and in the neighborhood of the fixing unit. The noted disclosures in Hirose are not at all directed to such features.

At cited column 5, lines 17-45 Hirose discloses a low-voltage power supply 90 provided below a fixing device 18. However, that power supply 90 in Hirose does not correspond to the claimed “secondary power supply” as that power supply 90 in Hirose does not provide power to heaters also charged by a main power supply.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of February 20, 2007, page 4, prenumbered paragraph 9, lines 13-16.

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of February 20, 2007, page 4, prenumbered paragraph 9, lines 16-17.

In further detail, according to Hirose “the low-voltage power supply unit 90 is a unit for lowering a single-phase voltage of 100 V supplied from outside of the laser printer 1 to a voltage of 24 V and supplying the lowered voltage to each section of the laser printer 1”.<sup>3</sup>

In such ways the low-voltage power supply unit 90 of Hirose does not correspond to the claimed “secondary power supply that provides another portion of the heaters with power charged by said main power supply”. As a non-limiting example discussed in the present specification, the claimed “secondary power supply” can be a device such as a capacitor that charges the heaters charged by the main power supply with power. The low-voltage power supply unit 90 in Hirose does not correspond to such a secondary power supply.

Moreover, Hirose also discloses a high-voltage power supply unit 95, but that element also differs from the claimed “secondary power supply” as the power supply unit 95 in Hirose is “a unit that generates a high-voltage bias to be applied to each portion of the process cartridge 17”.<sup>4</sup>

In such ways Hirose does not cure the recognized deficiency in Fujita with respect to the “secondary power supply”.

Moreover, the outstanding rejection relies on Nakafuji to disclose an insulation member disposed between a fixing unit and a power supply and to cover the secondary power supply at paragraphs [0040]-[0041].<sup>5</sup> Applicants also traverse that basis for the rejection.

The claims now more clearly recite “a heat insulation member disposed between said fixing unit and said secondary power supply”. As noted in the present specification at page 12, lines 22-24 “the insulation member prevents the capacitor from being heated to an excessive temperature by the heat generated by the fixation part”. Nakafuji is not believed to disclose or suggest such a heat insulation member.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hirose at column 5, lines 36-40.

<sup>4</sup> Hirose at column 5, lines 32-34.

<sup>5</sup> Office Action of February 20, 2007, page 5, lines 6-8.

Nakafuji discloses providing an “insulation member to such a degree that the user cannot touch them [the storage 17 and discharge circuit]”.<sup>6</sup> Nakafuji further states “[t]he fifth embodiment therefore protects the user from an electric shock and further enhances safety operation”.<sup>7</sup> Thereby, applicants submit Nakafuji discloses an electric insulation instead of a heat insulation. That understanding in Nakafuji is also consistent with the disclosure in paragraph [0041] in Nakafuji, which states “the storage 17 is kept away from heat output from the fixing device 116 and therefore free from trouble describable to the heat”. That sentence also appears to indicate that in Nakafuji a distance is utilized to avoid heat at the storage 17 rather than a heat insulation.

Thereby, Nakafuji is not believed to cure the deficiencies in Fujita with respect to the now claimed “heat insulation member”.

In view of these forgoing comments, applicants respectfully submit independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, recite features that distinguish over the applied art, and thereby those claims are believed to be allowable.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 2, 13-15, 18, 20, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujita in view of Nakafuji and Baan, the further rejection of claims 16 and 17 further in view of Setoriyama, and the further rejection of claims 19, 21, 32, and 33 further in view of Hirose, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 2 is also amended by the present response to recite a “heat insulation member”. For the reasons discussed above applicants respectfully submit Nakafuji does not cure the recognized deficiencies in Fujita with respect to the feature of the “heat insulation member”. Thereby, independent claim 2, and the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

---

<sup>6</sup> Nakafuji at paragraph [0040].

<sup>7</sup> Nakafuji at paragraph [0040].

Further, applicants respectfully submit the combination of teachings of Fujita and Nakafuji does not disclose the features of the “secondary power supply” which is “disposed between a side face of a chassis of the image forming apparatus and said fixing unit, or on the surface of the chassis of the image forming apparatus”.

With respect to the above-noted feature, the outstanding rejection cites Nakafuji at paragraph [0026].<sup>8</sup>

In reply to that basis for the rejection applicants note that at paragraph [0026] Nakafuji merely discloses a power supply circuitry 135. However, such a power supply does not correspond to the claimed “secondary power supply that provides another portion of the heaters with power charged by said main power supply”. Thereby, the disclosure relative to the power supply 135 in Nakafuji is not properly applicable to the claimed “secondary power supply”.

In such further ways independent claim 2, and the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to clearly distinguish over Fujita in view of Nakafuji and Baan.

Applicants also note deficiencies in Hirose are discussed above and are believed to also further address the rejection of claims 19, 21, 32, and 33 that were further rejected in view of Hirose.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as written distinguish over the applied art.

---

<sup>8</sup> Office Action of February 20, 2007, page 6, lines 6-9.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

JJK:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\26s\267493\267493US-AM1.DOC